FILE COPY

Office Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 19 1959
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1959

No. 535

UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS DIVISION OF TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, in its own right and as representative of the UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL 1463, and its members, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

against

THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY, *et al.*,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

GEORGE HALPERN,
Counsel for Petitioners, Railroad Marine Union, et al.,
120 East 41st Street,
New York, New York.

EDITH LOWENSTEIN,
Counsel for Petitioners, United Railroad Workers Division of Transport Workers Union of America, and United Railroad Workers of America, Local 1463, et al.,
501 Fifth Avenue,
New York, New York.

CARL E. NEWTON,
Counsel for Petitioners, Bernard Kearns, John L. Murray and James P. Ambrose, individually and as officers of Local M-108 United Marine Workers Division of District 50, United Mine Workers of America,
2 Wall Street,
New York, New York.

NEVILLE MILLER,
ALFRED D. TREHERNE,
Washington, D.C.,
ERNEST FLEISCHMAN,
JOHN J. O'DONNELL,
New York, New York,
Of Counsel.

INDEX TO PETITION

	PAGE
Opinions Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented	3
Statutes Involved	4
Statement of Case and Disposition Below	4
Reasons For Granting the Writ	9
Conclusion	15
Appendix A—Statutes	16
Appendix B—Opinion Below	19
Appendix C—Decision Below Denying Petition for Rehearing	34
Appendix D—Judgment Below	36
Proof of Service	38

CITATIONS

Cases:

	PAGE
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, et al. v. Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, et al., October Term, 1959, No. 165	2, 3, 9, 10
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago River & Ind. R.R. Co., 353 U. S. 30, 41-42 (1957)	3, 12, 14
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Toledo, P. & W. R. Co., 321 U. S. 50 (1944)	13, 14
Butte, Anaconda, Pacific Railway Co. v. Brotherhood of L. F. & E., 268 F. 2d 54 (9th Cir. 1959)	13
Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Co. v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 266 F. 2d 335 (5th Cir. 1959)	10, 12
Order of Railway Conductors of America v. Pitney, 326 U. S. 561 (1946)	12
Railroad Yardmasters of America v. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 224 F. 2d 226 (3rd Cir. 1955)	12
Virginian Railroad Co. v. System Federation No. 40, Railway Employees Department of American Federation of Labor, 300 U. S. 515 (1937)	12

Statutes:

Norris-LaGuardia Act, 47 Stat. 72 (1932), Section 8 (29 U.S.C. §108)	13, 16
Railway Labor Act, 48 Stat. 1185 (1934) and 64 Stat. 1238 (1951):	
Sec. 1a (1), (4), and (5) (45 U.S.C. §151a (1), (4) and (5))	11, 14, 16
Sec. 2 (First), (Second), and (Seventh) (45 U.S.C. §152 (First), (Second), and (Seventh))	11, 14, 16, 17
Sec. 3 (First-(i)) (45 U.S.C. §153 (First-(i))	11, 17
Sec. 6 (45 U.S.C. §156)	11, 14, 17, 18

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1959

No.....

UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS DIVISION OF TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, in its own right and as representative of the UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL 1463, and its members, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

against

THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY, *et al.*,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

The United Railroad Workers Division of the Transport Workers Union of America and certain officers thereof named in the complaint in this action, the United Railroad Workers of America, Local 1463 and certain officers thereof named in the complaint in this action, the Railroad Marine Union and certain officers thereof named in the complaint in this action, and Bernard Kearns, John J. Murray and James P. Ambrose individually and as officers of Local M-108 United Marine Workers, Division of District 50, United Mine Workers of America (hereinafter

referred to as "petitioners") pray that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit filed in the above-entitled case on October 2, 1959.

Petitioners further pray that should a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in this case, this Court review said judgment concurrently with its review of the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in the case of *The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, et al.* v. *Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company et al.*, October Term, 1959, No. 165, in which certiorari was granted by this Court on October 12, 1959, as the question therein accepted by this Court for review is almost identical to the first of two questions presented by this petition.

Opinions Below

The opinion of the District Court is printed at pages 142a-162a of the Joint Appendix below and is reported in 176 F. Supp. 53. The opinion of the Court of Appeals, printed in Appendix B hereto, *infra*, pages 19-33, is not as yet reported. The decision of the Court of Appeals denying the Petition for Rehearing, printed in Appendix C hereto, *infra*, pages 34-35, is not as yet reported.

Jurisdiction

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was dated and entered on October 2, 1959. Appendix D, *infra*, pages 36-37. Rehearing was denied on November 12, 1959. Appendix C, *infra*, pages 34-35.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C., Section 1254(1).

Questions Presented

1. Whether a District Court under circumstances where a dispute arising under the Railway Labor Act has been submitted by railroads to the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the New York Harbor Marine Board of Adjustment and an injunction against a strike by employees is sought on authority of *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Chicago River and Ind. R.R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, may on the granting of an injunction impose reasonable conditions designed to protect the employees against a harmful change in working conditions during pendency of the dispute before the Adjustment Board by ordering that the railroads restore the status quo, or, in the alternative, pay the employees the amount they would have been paid had changes in working conditions giving rise to the dispute not been made?

(With the exception of reference to railroads in the plural sense and addition of the phrase "and the New York Harbor Marine Board of Adjustment", this question is the same one as was accepted by this Court in *The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, et al.* v. *Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, et al.*, October Term, 1959, No. 165, now pending review.)

---

2. Whether the Norris-LaGuardia Act prohibits the issuance of an injunction against a strike by railroad employees where railroad employers have summarily discharged a craft of employees and have made no attempt to comply with their duty under the Railway Labor Act nor made any reasonable effort to settle the labor dispute caused by their action when the District Court from which

the injunction is sought does not further grant a mandatory injunction to restore the discharged employees to their former positions pending the completion and exhaustion of the procedures and processes of the Railway Labor Act?

Statutes Involved

The statutory provisions involved are Sections 1a(1), 1a(4), 1a(5), 2 (First), 2 (Second), 2 (Seventh), 3 (First-(i)), and 6 of The Railway Labor Act, 48 Stat. 1185 (1934) and 64 Stat. 1238 (1951) 45 U.S.C. §§151a(1), (4) and (5), 152 (First), (Second), and (Seventh), 153 (First-(i)), and 156; and Section 8 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, 47 Stat. 72 (1932), 29 U.S.C. §108. They are printed in Appendix A, *infra*, pages 16-18.

Statement of Case and Disposition Below

The ten railroad respondents herein, on the morning of June 10, 1959, without advance notice to either the petitioners or affected employees, posted notices abolishing the positions variously designated as "oiler," "firemen" or "oiler firemen" (hereinafter referred to as "oiler") on all of their diesel-powered tug boats, effective 12:01 A.M. June 15, 1959 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit B, 138a).[1] This unilateral action, taken simultaneously by the ten railroads, completely abolished the craft of oiler on seven of the ten railroads, which operate diesel tugs exclusively and abolished the craft of oiler on diesel tugs on the three railroads which still maintain both diesel and steam tugs.

The immediate result was the abolition of at least 125 regular oiler positions and the summary firing of at least 125 regularly assigned employees, together with a sub-

[1] Page references are to the Joint Appendix below, which contains all Exhibits except Plaintiffs' Exhibits A-1 through A-6 and D, which are filed separately.

stantial number of extra oilers, i.e., men not regularly assigned (81a, 145a).

The controversy thus precipitated has widespread effect, for, as was recognized in the dissent below, it is a phase of a nationwide dispute which may reach crisis proportions within a few months (ft. note 1, pages 28-29, *infra*).

The action by the railroads, obviously executed after substantial preparation and deliberation among themselves, was taken without any prior notice to or negotiation with the employees or the unions concerned. The railroads made no attempt whatsoever to negotiate with the unions or even to discuss the planned abolition prior to their action of June 10, 1959 (68a; 150a).

The District Court below found that this action of the railroads was the cause of the labor dispute in question (144a, 156a).

On the morning of June 15, 1959, the abolition of the positions became effective. At that time, fellow employees refused to pass picket lines set up by the fired oilers acting completely independently of their respective unions (48a; 69a; 80a). A work stoppage on all railroad tugboats occurred (145a) and marine operations of the railroad respondents in New York Harbor came to a halt until restoration of the abolished positions on June 20, 1959, pursuant to the order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Bryan, D.J. (163a).

The firing of the oilers and the resulting disruption of marine service caused serious hardship to the public, loss of revenue to the railroads (147a), and great injury to the fired oilers and their unions (41a; 49a; 51a). The marine operations of respondents are an important link in their transportation service by way of interchange and otherwise. The facilities handle approximately 49 million tons

of freight per year, and the float service operated by the tugs in question handles an average of 1,547 cars of freight daily (147a).

The respondents operate approximately 60 tugs in their marine operations. Approximately 44 of these tugs are diesel-powered, and approximately 15 are steam-powered (54a). Seven of the ten railroads operated only diesel tugs on June 10, 1959, and also when each of them entered into currently effective bargaining agreements covering the oiler craft.

There has been no change in the extent of the dieselization of tugs and no technological development in diesel operation on any of the railroads since current collective bargaining agreements became effective (93a). There are six collective bargaining agreements in question which have effective dates of November 18, 1955, December 1, 1955, January 1, 1956, January 11, 1957 and January 19, 1959 (Plaintiffs' Exhibits A-1—A-6).

The duties of the oiler on the diesel tugs are extensive and responsible and include fueling the tug, wiping and greasing the engines and other machinery, cleaning and inspection duties, acting as a safety guard, and assisting and relieving the engineer. As a result of the abolition of the oiler position a single engineer became the only person assigned to duties in the engine room of the diesel tug boats, and the oiler duties were necessarily transferred to the engineer. This transfer constituted a substantial change in the engineer's job (46a-47a).

In the labor agreements covering the oiler craft on all of the respondent railroads, except the Pennsylvania Railroad, there is the following provision.

> "Established positions shall not be discontinued or abolished and new ones created under different titles covering relatively the same classes of work

for the purpose of reducing rates of pay and evading the applications of the articles of this Agreement." (Plaintiffs' Exhibit A-2, Article 15, page 18)

When the union petitioners were informed by their members that the notice of June 10, 1959 had been posted they notified the respondent railroads by telegram that they considered this summary action a violation of existing collective bargaining agreements and that a strike of tug boat personnel had been authorized for June 15, 1959, at 12:01 A.M. when the respondents' abolition of established oiler positions was to become effective (Plaintiffs' Exhibits E and F, 140a, 141a).

The railroads, after substantial preparation prior to June 10, 1959, commenced the present action and obtained a temporary restraining order from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Murphy, D.J., on June 11, 1959. On the same date they filed lengthy and detailed mimeographed *ex parte* submissions to Adjustment Boards established under the Railway Labor Act, which submissions sought a ruling from the Boards that the abolition of the positions in this manner was proper. On June 15, 1959 petitioners filed a cross-motion for an order directing the railroads to restore the oilers to their former positions pending the determination of the dispute under procedures authorized by the Railway Labor Act.

The refusal of the railroads to negotiate in good faith or to discuss the dispute with the unions is illustrated by the tactics which the respondents employed in filing of *ex parte* submissions with the Adjustment Boards and in seeking equitable relief from the District Court.

On June 11, 1959, prior to receipt of notice from two of the union respondents herein of an intention to strike, all respondents made *ex parte* submissions of the dispute to

Adjustment Boards (Plaintiffs' Exhibits D, E and F, 140a, 141a). The unions herein were not informed of such submissions until the hearing of June 16, 1959 on the two motions, and they were given copies of such submissions only by direction of the District Court (101a, 102a), despite allegations in the submissions of certain respondents that "all data contained herein have been presented to the representatives of the organization involved herein" (Plaintiffs' Exhibit D). Indeed, one of the respondents in fact made application for the restraining order of June 11, 1959, prior to notice from the union representing its employees of an intention to strike (30a-32a; 140a).

When the District Court below issued the temporary restraining order each of the unions herein immediately cancelled its strike authorization and instructed its members not to strike (48a; 69a; 70a; 95a). This action, however, did not affect the right of the fired oilers, who were no longer members of the collective bargaining unit, to demonstrate against their summary firing. None of their former fellow employees would cross hastily erected picket lines set up by these men, with the result that all freight haulage in New York Harbor ceased (62a; 69a; 70a).

The situation was remedied by the order of the District Court on June 20, 1959 (163a-165a), which granted both the respondents' motion for a preliminary injunction against a strike or work stoppage and petitioners' cross-motion for a mandatory injunction restoring the discharged employees to their former positions. The Court ordered that both injunctions remain in effect until the procedures and processes of the Railway Labor Act for the settlement of the dispute had been completed and exhausted. The effect of the order was to restore the situation to the status quo as of immediately prior to

June 10, 1959, the date of respondents' precipitate action (156a).

Respondents appealed to the Court of Appeals from that portion of the order which granted the mandatory injunction, and petitioners cross-appealed from that portion of the order which granted the preliminary injunction. The Court of Appeals (Clark, Chief Judge, and Swan and Moore, Circuit Judges) reversed the mandatory injunction and affirmed the preliminary injunction in an opinion from which Chief Judge Clark dissented (Appendix B, *infra*, pages 19-33). On October 16, 1959, petitioners herein filed a Petition for Rehearing in the Court of Appeals. This petition was denied on November 12, 1959 by the same court with Chief Judge Clark again dissenting (Appendix C, *infra*, pages 34-35).

The basis for the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York was alleged by respondents to be the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. Section 151-188), 28 U.S.C. Sections 1331-1337, and the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U.S.C. Sections 1 *et seq.* (5a).

Reasons for Granting the Writ

1. The decision of the Court below in the instant case, like that of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, et al.* v. *Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, et al.* (October Term, 1959, No. 165, certiorari granted October 12, 1959) now before this Court for review, has decided an important question of federal law which has not been, but should be settled by this Court.

The Court below held that the Railway Labor Act denies jurisdiction to a District Court to grant a mandatory in-

junction to require employers to maintain the *status quo ante* pending the completion and exhaustion of the procedures and processes of the Railway Labor Act as a reasonable condition to the grant of an injunction against a strike by employees when the employers have referred this dispute to Adjustment Boards established under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

This issue is now before this Court in the *Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad* case, and the question therein accepted for review by this Court is appropriately stated herein in virtually identical language as the first question presented.

Not only does there exist an identity of issue between the two cases, but the Court below in fact relied on *Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Co.* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers*, 266 F. 2d 335 (5th Cir. 1959) as controlling precedent in reaching its conclusion that the grant of a mandatory injunction must be reversed.

The question presented here is basic to a determination of the intent and purpose of the Railway Labor Act. The decision of the Court of Appeals permits the frustration of the clear purpose of the Railway Labor Act and provides a means for carriers to nullify and emasculate important provisions of the Act.

This danger was ably described in the petition for a writ of certiorari filed with this Court in *The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al.* v. *Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railway Company et al.* The petition, speaking of a similar decision of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, characterized the danger as follows:

> "Under the holding of the Court of Appeals a carrier desiring to effect changes in working conditions embodied in collective bargaining agreements, and at the same time to avoid the procedures

> of notice, negotiation, mediation, and agreement prescribed in the agreements or in the Railway Labor Act, need only unilaterally order the changes to be made, decline to maintain the status quo, obtain an injunction against the strike provoked by its action, refer the matter to the Adjustment Board, ride out the years of decision in that Board in enjoyment of the changes unilaterally, and if it is wrong, unlawfully made by it, secure in the knowledge that the court from which it obtained the writ of injunction is powerless to require restoration and maintenance of the status quo as a condition of the grant of the writ."

Such result does violence to the clear intention of the Railway Labor Act set forth in Sections 151a (1), (4) and (5) as a statement of general purposes and in Sections 152 (First) and 152 (Second) as a statement of duties of carriers and employees under the Act. The decision further gives a cloak of immunity to a carrier which violates the mandate of Section 152 (Seventh) of the Act. It provides a means of by-passing and avoiding the requirements of Section 156 of the Act by unilateral action to characterize the dispute as one governed by Section 153 of the Act until such time as an Adjustment Board has ruled otherwise. The indiscriminate use of claims of managerial prerogative and assertions that a dispute is not governed by Section 156 has now become a weapon capable of destroying the intention and purpose of the Railway Labor Act.

The Court below in fact decided a federal question in a way in conflict with applicable decisions of this Court. This question concerns the powers of a District Court to exercise its equitable powers in a railway labor dispute of this nature.

There is clear authority that federal district courts are broadly empowered to issue injunctions and other appro-

priate orders to carry out the policies and purposes of the Railway Labor Act. *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & Ind. R.R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, 41 42 (1957); *Virginian Railroad Co.* v. *System Federation No. 40, Railway Employees Department of American Federation of Labor*, 300 U. S. 515 (1937); *Railroad Yardmasters of America* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad Co.*, 224 F. 2d 226 (3rd Cir. 1955). As stated in the dissent of Chief Judge Clark below, there is nothing in the Railway Labor Act or in the nature of Adjustment Board proceedings which demands that the powers of a District Court be radically limited or changed if a labor dispute contains an issue cognizable by an Adjustment Board.

The Court below found but limited precedent to support its holding that a District Court is not empowered to exercise its equitable powers to maintain the *status quo ante* in the dispute here. It could cite but one decision of this Court in support of its position: *Order of Railway Conductors of America* v. *Pitney*, 326 U. S. 561 (1946), which opinion is clearly distinguishable on the facts.

The only other authority cited by the Court below was the *Missouri-Kansas-Texas* case, with which petitioners herein seek a concurrent review by this Court and an earlier decision of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which the Court asserted was of similar effect.

2. The decision of the Court below should be reviewed because it decides a second important federal question which has not been, but should be, settled by this Court. This question is one of great importance to the administration of the national labor laws. It held that under the circumstances of this case, the Norris-LaGuardia Act presents no prohibition of the grant of the preliminary injunction against a strike or work stoppage.

It is submitted that where respondent railroads summarily abolished the craft of oiler and discharged all

employees in such craft and made no effort whatsoever to comply with their duty under the Railway Labor Act to discuss and negotiate the labor dispute caused by their action, a preliminary injunction against a work stoppage by employees cannot be granted when not joined with such mandatory injunction as was granted by the District Court below.

Section 8 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act (29 U.S.C. §108) states in clear language that injunctive relief shall not be granted to any complainant "who has failed to comply with any obligation imposed by law which is involved in the labor dispute in question, or has failed to make every reasonable effort to settle such dispute by negotiation or with the aid of any available governmental machinery • • •".

These provisions demand that any party to gain injunctive relief in a dispute of this nature must have in good faith made an attempt to use the processes and procedures provided by the Railway Labor Act, as this Court recognized in *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Toledo, P. & W. R. Co.*, 321 U. S. 50 (1944).

The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has recently applied this doctrine in the case of *Butte, Anaconda, Pacific Railway Co.* v. *Brotherhood of L. F. & E.*, 268 F. 2d 54 (9th Cir. 1959), where it found a labor dispute governed by Section 156 of the Railway Labor Act and denied injunctive relief to a railroad petitioner which had not complied with provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

Petitioners herein have asserted throughout these proceedings that the dispute involved is one to which the provisions of Section 156 of the Railway Labor Act are applicable. It is submitted that the circumstances here clearly demonstrate that this dispute should be considered

a "major dispute" within the terms of Section 156 and thus one to which the *Toledo* case applies.

Indeed, Chief Judge Clark noted that the instant controversy is of major importance irrespective of which statutory procedure is presently applicable to it. (Ft. note 1, pages 28-29, *infra.*)

The Court below relied upon *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & Ind. R.R. Co., supra,* as authority for its assertion that the Norris-LaGuardia Act does not prohibit the issuance of a preliminary injunction in this case after it ruled that the dispute was a "minor dispute". Petitioners submit that the Court below was in error in finding that the dispute herein was such a "minor dispute" that the authority of the *Toledo* case is not applicable.

Whether it is determined that the respondents here violated the duties of Section 152 (Seventh) and 156 of the Railway Labor Act, it is clear that they refused to carry out duties required by Sections 151a and 152 of the Act. Such refusal in the circumstances of this case when joined with their failure to make every reasonable attempt to settle the dispute should result in the denial of the railroads' application for injunctive relief.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE HALPERN,
Counsel for Petitioners, Railroad Marine Union, et al.,
120 East 41st Street,
New York 17, New York.

EDITH LOWENSTEIN,
Counsel for Petitioners, United Railroad Workers Division of Transport Workers Union of America and United Railroad Workers of America, Local 1463, et al.,
501 Fifth Avenue,
New York 17, New York.

CARL E. NEWTON,
Counsel for Petitioners, Bernard Kearns, John J. Murray and James P. Ambrose individually and as officers of Local M-108 United Marine Workers, Division of District 50, United Mine Workers of America,
2 Wall Street,
New York 5, New York

YELVERTON COWHERD,
ALFRED D. TREHERNE,
1435 K Street, Northwest
Washington 5, D. C.,

ERNEST FLEISCHMAN,
120 East 41st Street,
New York 17, New York,

JOHN F. O'DONNELL,
501 Fifth Avenue,
New York 17, New York,
Of Counsel.

APPENDIX A

Statutes Involved

1. Railway Labor Act, 1934, Section 1a (1), 1a (4), 1a (5), 2 (First), 2 (Second), 2 (Seventh), 3 (First-(i)), and 6; 45 U.S.C. §§ 151a (1), (4) and (5), 152 (First), (Second), and (Seventh), 153 (First-(i)), and 156; 48 Stat. 1185 (1934) and 64 Stat. 1238 (1951):

Sec. 151a *(General purposes):*

> The purposes of the chapter are: (1) To avoid any interruption to commerce or to the operation of any carrier engaged therein; * * * (4) to provide for the prompt and orderly settlement of all disputes concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions; (5) to provide for the prompt and orderly settlement of all disputes growing out of grievances or out of the interpretation or application of agreements covering rates of pay, rules, or working conditions."

Sec. 152 *(General duties—Duty of carriers and employees to settle disputes):*

> First. It shall be the duty of all carriers, their officers, agents, and employees to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, and working conditions, and to settle all disputes, whether arising out of the application of such agreements or otherwise, in order to avoid any interruption to commerce or to the operation of any carrier growing out of any dispute between the carrier and the employees thereof.
>
> Second. All disputes between a carrier or carriers and its or their employees shall be considered, and, if possible, decided, with all expedition,

in conference between representatives designated and authorized so to confer, respectively, by the carrier or carriers and by the employees thereof interested in the dispute.

* * * * * *

Seventh. No carrier, its officers, or agents shall change the rates of pay, rules, or working conditions of its employees, as a class, as embodied in agreements except in the manner prescribed in such agreements or in section 156 of this title.

Sec. 153 *(National Railroad Adjustment Board—Establishment; composition; powers and duties; divisions; hearings and awards):*

First. There is established a Board, to be known as the 'National Railroad Adjustment Board', the members of which shall be selected within thirty days after June 21, 1934, and it is provided—

* * * * *

(i) The disputes between an employee or group of employees and a carrier or carriers growing out of grievances or out of the interpretation or application of agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, including cases pending and unadjusted on June 21, 1934, shall be handled in the usual manner up to and including the chief operating officer of the carrier designated to handle such disputes; but, failing to reach an adjustment in this manner, the disputes may be referred by petition of the parties or by either party to the appropriate division of the Adjustment Board with a full statement of the facts and all supporting data bearing upon the disputes.

Sec. 156 *(Procedure in changing rates of pay, rules, and working conditions):*

Appendix A

Carriers and representatives of the employees shall give at least thirty days' written notice of an intended change in agreements affecting rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, and the time and place for the beginning of conference between the representatives of the parties interested in such intended changes shall be agreed upon within ten days after the receipt of said notice, and said time shall be within the thirty days provided in the notice. In every case where such notice of intended change has been given, or conferences are being held with reference thereto, or the services of the Mediation Board have been requested by either party, or said Board has proffered its services, rates of pay, rules, or working conditions shall not be altered by the carrier until the controversy has been finally acted upon, as required by section 155 of this title, by the Mediation Board, unless a period of ten days has elapsed after termination of conferences without request for or proffer of the services of the Mediation Board.

2. Norris-LaGuardia Act, 1932. Section 8; 29 U.S.C. § 108; 47 Stat. 72 (1932):

Sec. 108 *(Noncompliance with obligations involved in labor disputes or failure to settle by negotiation or arbitration as preventing injunctive relief):*

No restraining order or injunctive relief shall be granted to any complainant who has failed to comply with any obligation imposed by law which is involved in the labor dispute in question, or who has failed to make every reasonable effort to settle such dispute either by negotiation or with the aid of any available governmental machinery of mediation or voluntary arbitration.

APPENDIX B

Opinion Below.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

For the Second Circuit.

No. 354—October Term, 1958.

(Argued August 21, 1959 Decided October 2, 1959.)

Docket No. 25757

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company *et al.*,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

United Railroad Workers Division of Transport Workers Union of America *et al.*,
Defendants-Appellees.

Before:

Clark, *Chief Judge*,
and Swan and Moore, *Circuit Judges*.

Cross-appeals from an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York entered June 20, 1959, Hon. Frederick van P. Bryan, *Judge*.

Appellants appeal from that part of the order which by mandatory injunction required them to restore and maintain the *status quo ante* until the provisions of the Railway Labor Act for settlement of the labor dispute that is the subject matter of the action shall have been complied with. The appellees have cross-appealed from that part of the order which granted a preliminary injunction, enjoining

them from any strike or work stoppage during the same period.

Mandatory injunction reversed on appellants' appeal; preliminary injunction affirmed on appellees' cross-appeal.

SWAN, *Circuit Judge*:

These are cross-appeals from an order entered June 20, 1959 pursuant to an oral opinion of Judge Bryan. Both parties agree that the dispute between them is one within the scope of the Railway Labor Act, 45 U. S. C. A. §151 *et seq.* and the court below so ruled. The case was heard upon affidavits and concessions in colloquy with the court. The facts as stated in Judge Bryan's opinion are substantially as follows:

The appellants are ten interstate railroad corporations each of which has a collective bargaining agreement with one of the appellee labor organizations (the other appellees being officers and members thereof). Each of the railroad carriers operates in the New York Harbor area one or more diesel powered tugs in the transportation of interstate commerce. The marine operations of appellants are an important factor in the financial success of their business and in the efficiency of the service rendered to the public. Any disruption of such operations would be disastrous not only to them but also to the metropolitan area they serve.

On June 10, 1959 each of the appellants posted a notice, effective at 12:01 a.m. June 15, abolishing the position of oiler on their diesel powered tugs. Previously the engine room of these tugs had been manned by an engineer and an oiler, the latter being sometimes called a fireman, as he is on steam operated tugs. Upon learning of the post-

ing of such notices, appellee United Railroad Workers Division of Transport Workers Union of America, hereafter called T. W. U., by telegram dated 11:55 a.m., June 10, 1959, notified the seven appellants with which T. W. U. had collective bargaining agreements that it considered their action a violation of the agreements and had authorized a strike effective at 12:01 a.m. June 15, 1959.[1] After receipt of the strike threat, these seven appellants on June 11, 1959 made an *ex parte* submission of the dispute created by the threatened strike to the New York Harbor Marine Board of Adjustment as provided for in the applicable collective bargaining agreements. The other three appellants, The Long Island Railroad Company, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company and the Bush Terminal Railroad Company, made a similar *ex parte* submission to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, Fourth Division, Chicago, Illinois, as the collective bargaining agreements applicable to these three appellants did not provide for a special adjustment board. After submission to the appropriate Boards, the appellants filed the present suit to enjoin the threatened strike. A temporary restraining order was issued by Judge Murphy on the afternoon of June 11, 1959, and the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction was ordered to be heard on June 16, 1959. On that date the plaintiffs' motion came on before Judge Bryan, together with defendants' cross-motion for a mandatory injunction to restore the oilers to their former positions. Despite the temporary restraining order, a serious work stoppage did occur. The oilers who had been laid off began picketing piers where tug boats were

1. Similar telegrams were subsequently received by the other appellants from the other appellee labor organizations.

tied up. Employees in other crafts refused to cross the picket lines and all railroad traffic by water in the Harbor area ceased to move. On June 19, 1959 Judge Bryan rendered an oral opinion and by order entered June 20, 1959, granted both plaintiff's motion and defendants' cross-motion, both injunctions to remain in effect until the procedures of the Railway Labor Act, 45 U. S. C. A. §151 *et seq.*, for settlement of the dispute had been exhausted. Plaintiffs have appealed from that part of the order which directed restoration of the abolished positions. Defendants have appealed from that part of the order which granted a preliminary injunction against a strike or work stoppage, but they explain that their appeal is merely to protect themselves in case the plaintiffs' appeal shall succeed. The order re-established the status which existed before the labor dispute arose and defendants are satisfied with that situation.

The Railway Labor Act as interpreted by numerous cases recognizes two types of disputes between employer and employees, "minor" and "major." The distinction between them is clearly set forth in *Elgin, J. & E. R. Co.* v. *Burley*, 325 U. S. 711, 722-724, and was approved recently in *Trainmen* v. *Chicago R. & I. R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, 33. As there stated, "The first step toward settlement of either kind of dispute is negotiation and conference between the parties." Minor disputes arise out of the interpretation or application of existing collective bargaining agreements and grievances arising therefrom, while a major dispute is one that arises from an intended change in agreements affecting rates of pay, rules or working conditions. The Act provides procedures for the settlement of either type in order to prevent the disruption of interstate commerce

during its pendency. In the case of a minor dispute the parties are to confer and, if the dispute cannot be settled by conference, either party may resort to the appropriate division of the National Railroad Adjustment Board. 45 U. S. C. A. §153(i). In a minor dispute the railway employer is under no duty to restore the *status quo ante* during its pendency. In the case of a major dispute there is such a duty, 45 U. S. C. A. §156, and if the dispute is not adjusted by conference either party may invoke the services of the Mediation Board, or the latter may proffer its services. 45 U. S. C. A. §155(b).[2]

The appellants have consistently taken the position that as employers they have the managerial right (privilege) which the common law accords to an employer to discontinue an economically unnecessary position, unless the privilege has been lost by statute or by collective bargaining agreements with the unions. They assert that the Act has not curtailed this managerial privilege; that whether it has been lost by their agreements involves an interpretation of those agreements, and consequently the dispute is a minor one within the meaning of the Act. The appellees, on the other hand, contend that the railroads' action in abolishing the position of oiler on diesel powered tugs without prior notice to or discussion with the unions was a violation both of the collective bargaining agreements and of §156 of the Act, and consequently the dispute is a major one. Appellees further argue that even if the dispute be considered minor, the railroads had a duty to

2. By telegram dated June 15, 1959, 6:41 p.m. the National Mediation Board requested appellants and appellees to meet with Mediator O'Connell on June 16 for "discussion and investigation" of issues involved in this dispute. But the National Mediation Board never assumed jurisdiction of the controversy. The discussions were suspended pending disposition of the motions before the district court.

negotiate under the Railway Labor Act before they unilaterally abolished the position of oiler. The latter argument assumes that the mere posting of the notices of abolution created a dispute. We think the assumption fallacious. No dispute existed until the unions voiced disapproval of the railroads' action. This they did by threatening to strike. They might, however, have acquiesced in the railroads' interpretation of the agreements and not sent a strike threat. Until management announced its decision, the unions had no grievance, and nowhere in the Act is to be found any intimation that management must consult with union representatives before taking such action. The appellees argue that if the railroads were permitted to treat every dispute of this nature as a question of interpretation of the pre-existing agreements, they could thus nullify and emasculate §156 of the Act by asserting that their action was an exercise of their prerogative of management. The argument is answered to our satisfaction by the analysis of Judge Haynesworth in *Norfolk & P. B. L. R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen*, 4 Cir., 248 F. 2d 34, cert. den. 355 U. S. 914, derived from the Cox and Dunlop article in 63 Harvard Law Review 389, 401, which explicitly delineates at pages 41-42 the different purposes underlying §153 and §156.

> "All of such decisions [in the minor dispute category] when effectuated have a resultant effect upon working conditions and are of interest to employees and their representatives. They are none the less regarded as being within the prerogative of management alone to decide and effectuate in the first instance • • • If a matter falls within the second class of decision [major dispute], under the Railway Labor Act and under the applicable agreements, the

> carrier can make no change without initiating negotiation by giving the notice required under Section 6 of the Act and participating in the subsequent procedures available in aid of settlement of a 'major dispute.' • • •"

Primary jurisdiction to determine whether a dispute is minor or major resides in the agencies established by the Railway Labor Act. As to this the parties are not in disagreement. Appellants acknowledge it implicitly in their *ex parte* submissions to the Adjustment Boards. Appellees expressly acknowledge it in their Brief by the statement: "The role of the Court is to protect the jurisdiction of the Railway Labor Act agencies which are the appropriate bodies to decide the issues herein and to vindicate the policies and procedures of the Railway Labor Act to permit them to be carried out effectively." This view is correct as plainly indicated by *Order of Conductors* v. *Pitney*, 326 U. S. 561, where Mr. Justice Black, speaking for the Court said at page 567: "• • • The factual question is intricate and technical. An agency specially competent and specifically designated to deal with it has been created by Congress. Under these circumstances the court should exercise equitable discretion to give that agency the first opportunity to pass on the issue. Certainly the extraordinary relief of an injunction should be withheld, at least, until then. • • • Only after the Adjustment Board acts, but not until then, can it plainly appear that such relief is necessary to insure compliance with the statute. • • •"[3]

3. This language must be understood as applicable only to an injunction intended to maintain the *status quo ante*. It does not apply to an injunction restraining a threatened strike or work stoppage, the prevention of which is necessary "To avoid any interruption to commerce or to the operation of any carrier engaged therein; • • •" See 45 U. S. C. A. §151a which sets forth the general purposes of the Act.

Appendix B.

The Adjustment Board may decide (1) that the dispute is minor and that the Railroads' interpretation of the collective bargaining agreements is correct; or (2) that the dispute is minor but the Railroads' interpretation of the agreements is incorrect; or (3) that the dispute is major and the Adjustment Board has no jurisdiction. If the Adjustment Board decides that the Railroads' interpretation is correct, it is obvious that the district court has done an injustice to appellants by the mandatory restoration of the oilers to their former positions, for the railroads can never recover the wages they have been forced to pay. If the Adjustment Board decides that the railroads' interpretation is erroneous, the oilers will suffer no injustice for the Board can order restoration and back pay. If the Adjustment Board finds that it lacks jurisdiction because the dispute is major, then resort must be had to the National Mediation Board.

Judge Bryan did not decide whether the dispute was minor or major. We think he should have done so. It is clear that the respective contentions of the railroads and the unions are based on existing agreements. Their claims are to rights accrued, not to the creation of new rights for the future. Hence the dispute is a minor one, the resolution of which is committed to the Adjustment Board. Granting a mandatory injunction to restore the oilers to their former positions before the Adjustment Board has had an opportunity to act was erroneous. *Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of Loc. Eng.*, 5 Cir., 266 F. 2d 335, seems to be precisely in point. There it was held that since the jurisdiction to pass judgment on the merits of the dispute had been committed to the Adjustment Board, the district court could not, under the guise

of exercising its discretionary equity power, require the maintenance of the *status quo ante*. To do so is to decide the merits of the dispute before the Adjustment Board has acted. To similar effect is the decision of this court in *Stichman* v. *General Grievance Committee*, 2 Cir., 267 F. 2d 941, affirming on opinion below Judge Dawson's decision in 172 F. Supp. 329.

The unions further contend that abolition of the oilers' positions means extra work for the engineers, and that this is contrary to Article 15 of the Joint Agreement.[4] But this question also should be decided by the Adjustment Board before the district court undertakes to decide it at least when the answer is not perfectly clear.

Judge Bryan thought that the action of the railroads was not "in accordance with the theory or spirit of the Railway Labor Act." The factor that impelled him to preserve the *status quo ante* was undoubtedly his desire to avoid a tie-up of the appellants' marine operations by reason of the picket lines set up by the oilers and the refusal of other employees in related fields to cross the picket lines. However commendable the purpose of granting the mandatory injunction, we find nothing in the Act which authorizes it before the Adjustment Board has acted on the dispute. Accordingly it must be reversed.

Such reversal, however, does not mean that the court was powerless to enjoin the threatened strike. If the unions are to have the benefits of the Act they must also discharge its obligations. The granting of the preliminary injunction against any strike or work stoppage until the pro-

4 "ARTICLE 15—CLASSIFICATION AND RATE BASIS

Established positions shall not be discontinued or abolished and new ones created under different titles covering relatively the same class of work for the purpose of reducing rates of pay and evading the applications of the articles of this Agreement."

cedures provided by the Act had been exhausted was plainly correct. As pointed out in *Trainmen v. Chicago R & I. R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, 39-42, the Norris-LaGuardia Act presents no prohibition of the injunction under the facts appearing in the present case.

CLARK, *Chief Judge* (dissenting):

In granting the injunction under appeal, which ordered the appellant railroads to reinstate their discharged diesel tug oilers pending resolution of the instant labor dispute by the appropriate statutory agency, Judge Bryan was particularly careful and thorough in supporting his action on grounds stated in a lengthy and reasoned opinion. Therein he set forth his basic conclusions that the precipitous abolition of these jobs by the railroads with less than five days' effective notice to the unions involved was in violation of the Railway Labor Act, 45 U. S. C. § 151 *et seq.*, and that temporarily reinstating the oilers was the only sure way to avoid a serious disruption of vital transportation services in the Port of New York. The order of injunction, thus so fully supported, seems to me an eminently sound and proper exercise of judicial power committed to a district judge's discretion. I would affirm the decision below in its entirety, and not merely the part directed against the unions, as my brothers hold.

Far too much attention has been directed on this appeal to the question whether the arbitration or the mediation procedures of the Railway Labor Act govern the instant labor dispute.[1] Without question, federal district courts

1 The designations "minor grievance" (or "dispute") and "major dispute," occasionally used to characterize these respective procedures, though these terms do not appear in the statutes, are particularly inapt here. It cannot be gainsaid that the instant controversy is in many respects of major importance irrespective

are broadly empowered to issue injunctions and other appropriate orders to carry out the policies and purposes of this Act. *Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & Indiana R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, 41-42; *Virginia Ry. Co.* v. *System Federation No. 40, Railway Employees Department of American Federation of Labor*, 300 U. S. 515; *Railroad Yardmasters of America* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.*, 3 Cir., 224 F. 2d 226; see also *Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen* v. *Howard*, 343 U. S. 768; *Graham* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen*, 338 U. S. 232; *Tunstall* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Ocean Lodge No. 76*, 323 U. S. 210; *Steele* v. *Louisville & N. R. Co.*, 323 U. S. 192; *Cunningham* v. *Erie R. Co.*, 2 Cir., 266 F. 2d 411. And there is nothing in the statute or in the nature of Adjustment Board proceedings which demands that these powers be radically limited or changed whenever a labor dispute contains an issue cognizable by such a Board.

Nor do I find anything in the two cases particularly relied on by my brothers to require the overturning of these settled legal principles or to furnish definitive support for the unreal and unworkable reading of the Act here made; each rests primarily on its own particular facts governing the exercise of discretion by a court of equity and cannot properly be erected into a general proposition. In *Order of Ry. Conductors of America* v. *Pitney*, 326 U. S. 561, the Court actually reversed a dismissal of an injunction suit to reinstate it, but coupled

---

of which statutory procedure is presently applicable to it; indeed, it is but a phase of the dispute as to dispensing with firemen on the dieselization of the railroads which has assumed major importance in this country and Canada. It would seem that these plaintiff railroads have jumped the gun on what may prove to be a nationwide crisis in a few months. See Barden, *Railroad Labor Crisis*, The Nation, Sept. 12, 1959, p. 128.

this reversal with a direction to the trial court to stay action until decision by an Adjustment Board, since it felt that a back pay award for interim wages lost would adequately compensate the employees and avoid irreparable injury. Justice Rutledge in dissenting thought that immediate action was necessary for the workers' protection. In *Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers*, 5 Cir., 266 F. 2d 335, the court vacated an injunction reinstating discharged employees, expressing concern lest the grant of an injunction involve a prejudgment on the merits before action by an Adjustment Board. In that case, as in the *Pitney* case, immediate action was not required to avoid a major disruption of transportation, and they should be thus differentiated from the present case. And I can see nothing amounting to a prejudgment of the merits by Judge Bryan more than might perhaps be equally argued from a denial of an injunction.[2]

Judge Bryan was clearly correct in holding that the railroads' precipitous action violated their duties under the Railway Labor Act. Sec. 2 of the Act, 45 U. S. C. §152, applicable to all types of labor disputes, both "major" and "minor," provides:

> "First. It shall be the duty of all carriers, their officers, agents, and employees to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements

2 My brothers also cite *Norfolk & P. B. L. R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of R. R. Trainmen, Lodge No. 514*, 4 Cir., 248 F. 2d 34, certiorari denied 355 U. S. 914, and *Stickman* v. *General Grievance Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen*, 2 Cir., 267 F. 2d 941, affirming *In re Hudson & Manhattan R. Co.*, D. C. S. D. N. Y., 172 F. Supp. 329—cases where the district court had granted an injunction enjoining a strike where after months of negotiation of a minor dispute the union had refused to follow the arbitration procedure. But these cases support that part of the judgment which I would join my brothers in affirming; they did not involve and do not consider the validity of an order requiring the employers to maintain the status quo during the proceeding.

concerning rates of pay, rules, and working conditions, and to settle all disputes, whether arising out of the application of such agreements or otherwise, in order to avoid any interruption to commerce or to the operation of any carrier growing out of any dispute between the carrier and the employees thereof.

"Second. All disputes between a carrier or carriers and its or their employees shall be considered, and, if possible, decided, with all expedition, in conference between representatives designated and authorized so to confer, respectively, by the carrier or carriers and by the employees thereof interested in the dispute."

The instant controversy did not arise from one of the many situations where management may justifiably and in good faith take unilateral action without prior notice to or consultation with the representatives of its employees. Cf. *Order of Ry. Conductors of America* v. *Pitney, supra*, 326 U. S. 561. Such decisions are not effected with the elaborate legal preparations designed to bring off a *fait accompli* which preceded appellants' abolition of the position of oiler here. It is clear from the objective evidence in the record of appellants' careful planning—one appellant even made application for a temporary restraining order before it had received any communication from defendant unions in regard to the oilers it had discharged—that the management of the railroads well knew their action would evoke most forceful protests and make a work stoppage all but inevitable.

In comparable situations carriers have customarily given substantial advance notice of their intentions and fully negotiated the issues before taking definitive action.

See *In re Hudson & Manhattan R. Co.*, D. C. S. D. N. Y., 172 F. Supp. 329, affirmed on opinion below, *Stichman* v. *General Grievance Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen*, 2 Cir., 267 F. 2d 941; *Norfolk & P. B. L. R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen, Lodge No. 514*, 4 Cir., 248 F. 2d 34, certiorari denied 355 U. S. 914; *Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen* v. *New York Cent. R. Co.*, 6 Cir., 246 F. 2d 114, certiorari denied 355 U. S. 877.[3] There is no reason why this could not have occurred here. Surely on the facts of this case the suggestion that no "dispute" existed and the railroads had no duty to negotiate or otherwise act in good faith until after the unions protested the discharges of the oilers is a strange and wonderful and wholly nullifying reading of the above quoted portions of the Railway Labor Act. These men have permanently lost their livelihood; it is an obvious solecism to require them to make some sort of formal protest before any dispute can become apparent to us.

Finally, the cold hard reality here is, as Judge Bryan found, that only if the oilers are reinstated can a work stoppage and transportation tie-up in the Port of New York be avoided with any certainty, since these displaced workers cannot be enjoined from individual picketing. This fact cannot properly be ignored or deemed irrelevant; it is at the core of the only matter which is the proper concern of this court or the court below. Our sole function here is to further the *public* interest in avoiding a disruption of inter-state commerce, not to safeguard the financial position of the railroads or to punish the respondent unions for calling a strike. Only to this limited extent has Con-

[3] Even in *Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers*, 5 Cir., 266 F. 2d 335, the railroad gave more than two weeks' effective notice to the union.

gress superseded the general prohibition against federal court interference in railway labor disputes. *Virginian Ry. Co.* v. *System Federation No. 40, Railway Employees' Department of American Federation of Labor*, *supra*, 300 U. S. 515, 552; *Order of Ry. Conductors of America* v. *Pitney*, *supra*, 326 U. S. 561, 566. We should not reverse the sound decision of a conscientious district judge which clearly provides the best possible means of protecting this vital public interest.

APPENDIX C

DECISION BELOW DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 354—October Term, 1958.

(Petition filed October 16, 1959

Decided November 12, 1959.)

Docket No. 25757

THE BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS DIVISION OF TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, in its own right and as representative of the UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL 1463, and its members, *et al.*,

Defendants-Appellees.

Before:

CLARK, Chief Judge,

and SWAN and MOORE, *Circuit Judges.*

On Petition for Rehearing.

PER CURIAM:

Petition denied.

CLARK, *Chief Judge* (dissenting):

The Supreme Court has now granted certiorari in the case here relied on as controlling precedent, *Missouri-*

Appendix C

Kansas-Texas R. Co. v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 5 Cir., 266 F. 2d 335, and has accepted as the question for consideration one with direct implications for the issues here. It is thus stated: "Whether a district court under circumstances where a dispute arising under the Railway Labor Act has been submitted by a railroad to the National Railroad Adjustment Board and an injunction against a strike by employees is sought on authority of *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago River and Ind. R.R. Co.*, 353 U.S. 30, may on the granting of an injunction impose reasonable conditions designed to protect the employees against a harmful change in working conditions during pendency of the dispute before the Adjustment Board by ordering that the railroad restore the status quo, or, in the alternative, pay the employees the amount they would have been paid had changes in working conditions giving rise to the dispute not been made." 28 U.S.L. Week 3108. This action, it seems to me, points up the doubtful nature of our decision. Because of the uncertainty thus created and because of the irreparable loss to the employees which our decision will inevitably cause, I believe restudy of the problem is most desirable. I would grant the rehearing.

APPENDIX D

JUDGMENT BELOW

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

At a Stated Term of the United States Court of Appeals, in and for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Courthouse in the City of New York, on the second day of October one thousand nine hundred and fifty nine.

Present: Hon. CHARLES E. CLARK, Chief Judge.
Hon. THOMAS W. SWAN,
Hon. LEONARD P. MOORE, Circuit Judges.

BALTIMORE & OHIO RR Co., BUSH TERMINAL RR Co., CENTRAL RR Co. OF N. J., DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA & WESTERN RR Co., ERIE RR Co., THE LEHIGH VALLEY RR Co., LONG ISLAND RR Co., NEW YORK CENTRAL RR Co., NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RR Co., and the PENNSYLVANIA RR Co.,

Plaintiffs-Appellants.

v.

UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS DIVISION OF THE TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL 1463, *et al.*,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now hereby ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the order of said District Court be and it hereby is reversed as to the mandatory injunction and affirmed as to the preliminary injunction in accordance with the opinion of this Court; with costs to the appellants.

A. Daniel Fusaro,
Clerk.

Proof of Service

I, CARL E. NEWTON, counsel for certain of the petitioners herein, and a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, hereby certify that, on the 19th day of November 1959, I served copies of the foregoing petition for writ of certiorari on the Respondents, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al., by mailing copies in duly addressed envelopes, with first-class postage prepaid, to Respondents' attorneys of record as follows: to Edward F. Butler, E. Sherwood Alexander, and Manuel Schultz, Esqs., 39 Broadway, New York 6, New York; and to Joseph P. Allen, Esq., 55 West 42nd Street, New York 36, New York.

CARL E. NEWTON

.....

CARL E. NEWTON
Counsel for Bernard Kearns, John J. Murray and James P. Ambrose individually and as officers of Local M-108 United Marine Workers, Division of District 50, United Mine Workers of America,
2 Wall Street,
New York 5, New York

FILE COPY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 21 1959
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM—1959

No. 535

UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS DIVISION OF TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, in its own right and as representative of the UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL 1463, and its members, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

against

THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION

JOSEPH P. ALTER,
Attorney for Respondents.
Office & P. O. Address,
55 West 42nd Street,
New York 36, New York

INDEX

	PAGE
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Question Presented	2
Statutes Involved	2
Statement of Case and Proceedings Below	2
Argument:	
The Petition Should Be Denied Since the Decision Below Is Manifestly Correct and the Questions Alleged to Be Presented by the Petition Are Not Involved in This Cause	4
(1) The Decision of the Court Below Is Manifestly Correct	4
(2) The Questions Allegedly Presented by the Petition Are Not Involved in This Cause	9
Conclusion	14
Appendix A	15

CITATIONS

Cases:

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al. v. Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railway Co., 266 F. 2d 335, cert. granted 361 U. S. 810	11
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago River & Ind. R.R. Co., 353 U. S. 30	4, 7, 9, 12
Elgin J. & E.R.R. Co. v. Burley, 325 U. S. 711	5
Order of Railway Conductors v. Pitney, 326 U. S. 561	5, 7, 10

PAG

Statutes:

Norris-La Guardia Act, 47 Stat. 72 (1932); 29 USC § 101 et seq. 5, 7, 1

Railway Labor Act, 48 Stat. 1185 (1934) and 64 Stat. 1238 (1951):

Sec. 1a (45 USC § 151a) 4,

Sec. 2 (First) (Second) (Sixth) (Seventh) (45 USC § 152 (First, Second; Sixth and Seventh) 5, 1

Sec. 3 (First-i-) (45 USC § 153 First-i-) .....

Sec. 5 (First (a), (b) (45 USC § 155 First (a), (b)) .....

Sec. 6 (45 USC § 156) .....

Sec. 10 (45 USC § 160) .....

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1959

No. 535

UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS DIVISION OF TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, in its own right and as representative of the UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL 1463, and its members, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

against

THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY, *et al.*,

Respondents.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION

Opinions Below

The opinion of the District Court is printed at pages 142a-162a of the Joint Appendix below, and is reported in 176 F. Supp. 53. The opinion of the Court of Appeals is printed in Appendix B of the Petition, pages 19-33 and is reported in 271 F. 2d 87. The decision of the Court of Appeals denying the Petition for Rehearing is printed in Appendix C of the Petition, pages 34-35 but is not yet officially reported.

Jurisdiction

The jurisdictional requisites are adequately set forth in the Petition.

Question Presented

Whether or not interstate carriers are required to maintain the *status quo ante* in a situation arising out of a "minor dispute" within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act where the dispute has been submitted to the Adjustment Board and where the employees have an adequate remedy at law and will not suffer irreparable harm in the absence of such requirement.

Statutes Involved

The Statutes involved are Sections 1A, 2(First), 2(Second), 2(Sixth), 2(Seventh), 3(First—(i)), 5, 6, and 10 of the Railway Labor Act, 48 Stat. 1185(34) and 64 Stat. 1238(51); 45 U.S.C., 151a, 152(First), (Second), (Sixth), and (Seventh), 153(First—(i)), 155(First)(a) and (b), 156 and 160. All of these sections are set forth in Appendix A below.

Statement of the Case and Proceedings Below

On June 10, 1959, without attempting to pursue any of the procedures of the Railway Labor Act, the petitioner, United Railroad Workers Division of Transport Workers Union of America (hereinafter referred to as T.W.U.), called an illegal strike by its members who are employed by the respondents in their marine operations in New York Harbor, and actively solicited the support of other Unions in the Harbor (13a, 14a).[1] The action of the T.W.U.

[1] Unless otherwise stated page references are to the Joint Appendix below, which contains all exhibits except Plaintiffs' Exhibits A-1 through A-6 and D, which are filed separately.

was immediately followed by a similar strike call by the other two Union petitioners herein (Plaintiffs' Exhibits E and F, 140a, 141a).

In calling the strike, the petitioners claimed that the abolition by respondents of the position of fireman on their diesel tugs, notice of which had been given by the respondents on June 10, 1959 to become effective June 15, 1959, was in violation of existing applicable collective bargaining agreements between the petitioners and the respondents (50a). Upon receipt of the strike threat, the respondents made an *ex parte* submission of the dispute thereby created to the New York Harbor Marine Board of Adjustment as provided for in the applicable collective bargaining agreements for seven of the respondents herein and to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, Fourth Division, with respect to three of the respondents herein (18a).

After the submissions to the appropriate Boards, the respondents on June 11, 1959, obtained an *ex parte* temporary restraining order from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, per Murphy, J., enjoining the strike or work stoppage threatened by the petitioners (62a). Judge Murphy on the next day denied a motion by the petitioners to vacate said temporary restraining order, or in the alternative to modify said order by providing for the maintenance of the *status quo ante* (62a). On June 16, 1959, after a hearing, the District Court per Bryan, J., continued the temporary restraining order in effect against the petitioners (104a). Subsequently, by decision of June 19, 1959, Judge Bryan granted a preliminary injunction against the continued work stoppage but also granted the petitioners' cross motion for a mandatory injunction requiring the restoration of the abolished positions and the maintenance of the *status quo ante* until all procedures under the Railway Labor Act had been exhausted (143a-162a).

Pursuant to said order, respondents restored the abolished positions and immediately appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which unanimously affirmed the District Court's issuance of a preliminary injunction against the petitioners' illegal strike and reversed, by a divided Court, the mandatory injunction of the District Court requiring the maintenance of the *status quo ante* by the respondents (Petition 19).

After the denial of a motion for rehearing, the Court granted the petitioners' motion for a stay of the issuance of its mandate pending application by the petitioners to this Court for a writ of certiorari. The firemen thus are still maintained on the respondents' diesel tugs performing a useless and unnecessary job at a weekly cost to respondents of approximately $12,000.00, no part of which can ever be recovered.

The Petition Should Be Denied Since the Decision Below is Manifestly Correct and the Questions Alleged to be Presented by the Petition are Not Involved in This Cause

(1) The Decision of the Court Below is Manifestly Correct.

Upon the plain meaning of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. Sections 151 *et seq.*) and its interpretation by this Court the decision of the Court of Appeals is manifestly correct. Since the dispute which was created by the petitioners' illegal strike threat, and which has been submitted to the appropriate Adjustment Boards, involves the interpretation or application of an existing agreement it is clearly a "minor dispute" within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act and the decisions of this Court interpreting said Act.

This Court held in *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago River & Ind. R.R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, that a

carrier is entitled to injunctive relief against a strike by a labor organization over a "minor dispute" which is pending before the Adjustment Board notwithstanding the provisions of the *Norris-La Guardia Act*, 29 U.S.C. Sections 101-115. This Court has further held in *Order of Railway Conductors* v. *Pitney*, 326 U. S. 561, that the District Court should withhold the issuance of an injunction requiring the maintenance of the *status quo ante* with respect to employees who faced displacement, until the Adjustment Board has had an opportunity to pass on the dispute pending before it for, until that time, the employees cannot show that they have an inadequate remedy at law or that they will suffer irreparable harm.

While the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 155, 156 and 160) in the case of "major disputes" requires the maintenance of the *status quo* in the event either party desires to change a written agreement affecting "rates of pay, rules or working conditions" (45 U.S.C. 156) the Act imposes no such requirement with respect to "minor disputes" as the Court below correctly held. What is involved in the case at bar is clearly a "minor dispute."

The distinction between a "major" and a "minor dispute" arises in the Railway Labor Act itself (45 U.S.C. Sections 151 *et seq.*) and this terminology has been adopted by this Court to distinguish between a dispute arising out of the interpretation or application of an existing collective bargaining agreement (a "minor dispute", 45 U.S.C. 153 First (i)); and a dispute arising from an intended change in written agreements "effecting rates of pay, rules or working conditions" (a "major dispute", 45 U.S.C. 152 Sixth and Seventh; 45 U.S.C. 156).

The distinction between a "major dispute" and a "minor dispute" has been most clearly set forth by this Court in *Elgin J. & E. R.R. Co.* v. *Burley*, 325 U. S. 711, 723:

> "The first [major] relates to disputes over the formation of collective agreements or efforts to secure

them. They arise where there is no such agreement or where it is sought to change the terms of one, and therefore the issue is not whether an existing agreement controls the controversy. They look to the acquisition of rights for the future, not to assertion of rights claimed to have vested in the past.

"The second class [minor], however, contemplates the existence of a collective agreement already concluded or, at any rate, a situation in which no effort is made to bring about a formal change in terms or to create a new one. The dispute relates either to the meaning or proper application of a particular provision with reference to a specific situation or to an omitted case. In the latter event the claim is founded upon some incident of the employment relation, or asserted one, independent of those covered by the collective agreement, e.g., claims on account of personal injuries. In either case the claim is to rights accrued, not merely to have new ones created for the future."

Thus a "major dispute" looks to the acquisition of rights for the future, not to the assertion of rights claimed to have vested in the past. A "minor dispute", on the other hand, arises out of the interpretation or application of an existing collective agreement and relates to rights accrued or vested.

The contention of the petitioners is that the respondent's actions in abolishing the position of fireman on the diesel tugs violates an alleged vested or accrued right of the employees and the petitioners to these positions by virtue of existing agreements between the Union petitioners and respondents. Petitioners, while alleging that the respondents have violated the Railway Labor Act, attempt to justify the calling of a strike, without any resort to the processes and procedures of the Railway Labor Act, by alleging a violation by the respondents of existing agree-

ments. The petitioners' basic contention is that the applicable collective bargaining agreements prohibit the abolition of these positions. Respondents' position, on the other hand, is that the agreements do not prohibit the abolition of these positions and that the right to determine the size of the work force not having been bargained away, remains the right of management. Regardless of the merit of these respective contentions it is clear that what is presented by these respective contentions is clearly an interpretation or application of existing agreements and hence clearly a "minor dispute" within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act.

This Court has previously held in *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & Ind. R. R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, that a labor organization cannot resort to a strike over "minor disputes" pending before the Adjustment Board and that carriers are entitled to injunctive relief against such a strike notwithstanding the provisions of the *Norris-La Guardia Act*, 29 U.S.C. Sections 101-115. This Court has also held in *Order of Railway Conductors* v. *Pitney*, 326 U. S. 561, that the District Court under the Railway Labor Act should exercise equitable discretion to give Adjustment Boards the first opportunity to pass on issues arising out of the interpretation of collective bargaining agreements and that the granting of an injunction requiring the maintenance of the *status quo ante* with respect to employees who faced displacement should be withheld until the Adjustment Board had an opportunity to pass on the merits of the respective contentions presented. In the *Pitney* case, this Court further held in a dispute between two labor organizations as to which organization had the right to perform certain work that the organization representing employees about to be displaced could not show irreparable loss and inadequacy of the legal remedy until the Adjustment Board had passed upon the merits of the contentions of the contesting parties.

Thus, this Court has held that in a "minor dispute" which is pending before the Adjustment Board, the carrier is clearly entitled to an injunction against an illegal strike or work stoppage; that a District Court should exercise its equitable discretion to give the Adjustment Board the first opportunity to pass on the merits of the issues; and that the relief of an injunction requiring the maintenance of the *status quo ante* pending the resolution of such a dispute should be withheld since the employees cannot show irreparable harm or inadequacy of the legal remedy until the Adjustment Board determines the issue before it. These holdings are completely dispositive of all the issues in the case at bar.

These holdings are in accordance with the relationship of carriers and their employees under the Railway Labor Act, and are justified on practical as well as legal grounds. Carriers in the conduct of their business must daily make decisions and take actions which may give rise to disputes under existing agreements. Under the theory advanced by the petitioners, Unions could effectually paralyze employers in the administration of the business and of existing agreements by the device of threatening a strike and forcing a suspension of the employer's decision or action as a condition for refraining from strike action. Carriers who are inherently responsible for applying agreements and who attempt to do so in good faith, would be helpless to take any action without prior submission of the whole question to final disposition under grievance procedures. No such impractical and burdensome requirements are contemplated in the act or may they properly be imposed by Courts. Instead, carriers are subject to liability awards of the various Adjustment Boards, in the event that they make erroneous decisions in applying their collective agreements.

(2) The Questions Allegedly Presented by the Petition Are Not Involved in This Cause.

The questions framed by the petitioners in their petition are not involved in this case. The first question stated (Petition, p. 3) is as follows:

> "1. Whether a District Court under circumstances where a dispute arising under the Railway Labor Act has been submitted by railroads to the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the New York Harbor Marine Board of Adjustment and an injunction against a strike by employees is sought on authority of *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago River and Ind. R. R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, may on the granting of an injunction impose reasonable conditions designed to protect the employees against a harmful change in working conditions during pendency of the dispute before the Adjustment Board by ordering that the railroads restore the status quo, or, in the alternative, pay the employees the amount they would have been paid had changes in working conditions giving rise to the dispute not been made?"

In the case at bar, the dispute which is concededly under the Railway Labor Act, and which is a "minor dispute", has been submitted and is presently pending before the appropriate Adjustment Board as was the situation in *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago River and Ind. R.R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30. The District Court granted an injunction against the unlawful strike or work stoppage which had been called and aided by the petitioners, on the authority of the *Chicago River* case, *supra*. This injunction against the petitioners was affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

The District Court also granted the petitioners' cross-motion for an order requiring the maintenance of the

status quo ante with respect to the position of fireman on respondents' diesel tugs pending the "completion of appropriate processes under the Railway Labor Act" (158 (a)). This mandatory injunction against the respondents was a separate and distinct order and was not a "reasonable condition designed to protect the employees against a harmful change in working conditions during pendency of the dispute before the Adjustment Board", as the petitioners state. This injunction which the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed was granted by the District Court without any finding that in the absence of such relief the petitioners would have suffered irreparable harm and that they had no adequate remedy at law. Such a finding or holding would of course have been directly contrary to *Order of Railway Conductors* v. *Pitney*, 326 U. S. 561. The District Court did find however, and the Court of Appeals affirmed, that the respondents would suffer irreparable harm and had no adequate remedy at law in granting respondents injunctive relief against the illegal strike threat.

The injunction against respondents requiring the maintenance of the *status quo ante* can in no way be construed to have been "designed to protect the employees against a harmful change in working conditions" during pendency of the dispute before the Adjustment Board" as the term "change in working conditions" is used in the Railway Labor Act.

The phrase "change in working conditions" as used in the Petitioners' Brief has its genesis in Section Two, Seventh of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 152; Seventh) which provides as follows:

> "No carrier, its officers, or agents shall change the rates of pay, rules, or working conditions of its employees, as a class as embodied in agreements except in the manner prescribed in such agreements or in section 6 of this Act."

This Court explained in the *Pitney* case, *supra*, that what the phrase "change * * * working conditions" means is a change in those "working conditions" which are actually embodied in written agreements. Thus, as stated by Mr. Justice Black in the *Pitney* case, *supra*, page 565:

> "These sections [Sections 1, 2 Seventh, 2 Tenth and 6] make it clear that the only conduct which would violate Section 6 is a change of those working conditions which are 'embodied' in agreements."

In the case at bar, the petitioners have not and cannot show any "working condition" embodied in any of the applicable agreements which has been changed. There is nothing "embodied" in any of the agreements concerning the number of men which must be assigned to a crew of respondents' diesel tugs, nor is there anything in any of the agreements specifying how long any of these employees must be retained nor is there anything in any of the agreements restricting the right of the respondents to abolish these positions if in their judgment it becomes necessary for the continued sound economic operation of their marine operations.

By presenting a question to this Court indicating that "a harmful change in working conditions" is involved, the petitioners would seem to imply that what is here involved is a "major dispute" and not a "minor dispute" as was held by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit after the District Court had failed to classify the dispute as either "major" or "minor."

By so phrasing the "question presented", the petitioners quote (Petition, p. 10) from the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in the case of the *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al.* v. *Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company et al.*, 266 F. 2d 335 (5th Cir. 1959). Certiorari granted 361 U. S. 810. The portion of the Petition in that case which is quoted by the petitioners on page 10 shows

that it is an analysis of a situation in which a carrier desired "to effect changes in working conditions embodied in collective bargaining agreements." This can only have reference to a situation which is created as a result of a "major dispute" which results when either party seeks to change the terms of the agreement and this is clearly not involved in the case at bar.

The second question alleged to be presented by the petitioner (p. 3) is as follows:

> "Whether the Norris-La Guardia Act prohibits the issuance of an injunction against a strike by railroad employees where railroad employers have summarily discharged a craft of employees and have made no attempt to comply with their duty under the Railway Labor Act nor made any reasonable effort to settle the labor dispute caused by their action when the District Court from which the injunction is sought does not further grant a mandatory injunction to restore the discharged employees to their former positions pending the completion and exhaustion of the procedures and processes of the Railway Labor Act?"

The basic principle underlying this question was decided by this Court in *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & Ind. R. R. Co.*, 353 U. S. 30, when it held that the provisions of the *Norris-La Guardia Act*, 29 U.S.C. Section 101-115 did not prevent the issuance of injunctive relief to a carrier against a labor organization which resorted to a strike in a "minor dispute" pending before the Adjustment Board.

Again in framing this question the petitioners seek to justify their illegal strike threat without resorting to any of the processes of the Railway Labor Act by blithely alleging that the carriers made no attempt to comply with their duty under the Act to settle this labor dispute. This argument is specious and ignores the fact that the labor

"dispute" did not come into being until it was created by the petitioners' strike threat as the Court of Appeals has held. As the Court below stated (271 F. 2d 87, 90; Petition p. 24, Appendix B):

> "No dispute existed until the union's voiced disapproval of the railroads' action. This they did by threatening to strike. They might, however, have acquiesced in the railroads' interpretation of the agreements and not sent a strike threat. Until management announced its decision, the unions had no grievance, and nowhere in the Act is to be found any intimation that management must consult with union representatives before taking such action."

In a situation very similar to the case at bar this is exactly what happened with respect to at least one of the petitioners herein: Respondent Bush Terminal Railroad Company abolished the position of oiler on one trick or shift of the one diesel tug which they had in operation. The T.W.U. in that instance did not strike or threaten to strike but rather processed their claim under the provisions of the Act and the applicable agreement up to the highest officer on the property. They abandoned their position and acquiesced in the Company's position prior to submission to the Adjustment Board. In another instance the position of extra floatman was abandoned by respondents without any protest (pp. 58a and 63a).

The petitioners' insistence that the respondents have abolished a craft is unfounded and ignores the fact that on some of respondents' lines the firemen on diesel tugs who will be displaced can bid in on jobs as firemen on steam tugs (p. 90a). It also ignores the fact that the displaced firemen's seniority retirement and insurance rights are unaffected. It ignores the fact that the displaced employees retain their status as employees similar to that of furloughed employees. The furloughing of employees in the railroad industry, as petitioners admit, is a common

place thing and remains the unquestioned right of the carrier. (p. 101a). So too in the case at bar, since the respondents' action is not proscribed by law or by any of the agreements, they had the right to effectuate such a change as was intended. Neither the law nor the agreements required the respondents to confer with the petitioner before initiating such action. In the case at bar it is the petitioners who have made no attempt to comply with their duty under the Railway Labor Act but instead they called an illegal strike without resorting to any of the processes of the Act. To place a stamp of approval upon the petitioners' methods in the case at bar would completely vitiate the policy and purposes of the Act.

CONCLUSION

The Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH P. ALLEN,
55 West 42nd St.,
New York 36, New York.

Appendix A

Statutes Involved

Railway Labor Act

§ 151a.

The purposes of the chapter are: (1) To avoid any interruption to commerce or to the operation of any carrier engaged therein; (2) to forbid any limitation upon freedom of association among employees or any denial, as a condition of employment or otherwise, of the right of employees to join a labor organization; (3) to provide for the complete independence of carriers and of employees in the matter of self-organization to carry out the purposes of this chapter; (4) to provide for the prompt and orderly settlement of all disputes concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions; (5) to provide for the prompt and orderly settlement of all disputes growing out of grievances or out of the interpretation or application of agreements covering rates of pay, rules, or working conditions.

PAGE

§ 152.

First. It shall be the duty of all carriers, their officers, agents, and employees to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, and working conditions, and to settle all disputes, whether arising out of the application of such agreements or otherwise, in order to avoid any interruption to commerce or to the operation of any carrier growing out of any dispute between the carrier and the employees thereof.

Second. All disputes between a carrier or carriers and its or their employees shall be considered, and, if possible, decided, with all expedition, in conference be-

tween representatives designated and authorized so to confer, respectively, by the carrier or carriers and by the employees thereof interested in the dispute.

* * *

Sixth. In case of a dispute between a carrier or carriers and its or their employees, arising out of grievances or out of the interpretation or application of agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, it shall be the duty of the designated representative or representatives of such carrier or carriers and of such employees, within ten days after the receipt of notice of a desire on the part of either party to confer in respect to such dispute, to specify a time and place at which such conference shall be held: Provided, (1) That the place so specified shall be situated upon the line of the carrier involved or as otherwise mutually agreed upon; and (2) that the time so specified shall allow the designated conferees reasonable opportunity to reach such place of conference, but shall not exceed twenty days from the receipt of such notice: And provided further, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to supersede the provisions of any agreement (as to conferences) then in effect between the parties.

Seventh. No carrier, its officers, or agents shall change the rates of pay, rules, or working conditions of its employees, as a class, as embodied in agreements except in the manner prescribed in such agreements or in section 156 of this Act.

§ 153.

First. There is established a Board, to be known as the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the mem-

bers of which shall be selected within thirty days after June 21, 1934, and it is provided—

* * *

(i) The disputes between an employee or group of employees and a carrier or carriers growing out of grievances or out of the interpretation or application of agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, including cases pending and unadjusted on June 21, 1934, shall be handled in the usual manner up to and including the chief operating officer of the carrier designated to handle such disputes; but, failing to reach an adjustment in this manner, the disputes may be referred by petition of the parties or by either party to the appropriate division of the Adjustment Board with a full statement of the facts and all supporting data bearing upon the disputes.

§ 155.

First. The parties, or either party, to a dispute between an employee or group of employees and a carrier may invoke the services of the Mediation Board in any of the following cases:

(a) A dispute concerning changes in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions not adjusted by the parties in conference.

(b) Any other dispute not referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board and not adjusted in conference between the parties or where conferences are refused.

The Mediation Board may proffer its services in case any labor emergency is found by it to exist at any time.

In either event the said Board shall promptly put itself in communication with the parties to such contro-

versy, and shall use its best efforts, by mediation, to bring them to agreement. If such efforts to bring about an amicable settlement through mediation shall be unsuccessful, the said Board shall at once endeavor as its final required action (except as provided in paragraph third of this section and in section 160 of this title) to induce the parties to submit their controversy to arbitration, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

If arbitration at the request of the Board shall be refused by one or both parties, the Board shall at once notify both parties in writing that its mediatory efforts have failed and for thirty days thereafter, unless in the intervening period the parties agree to arbitration, or an emergency board shall be created under section 160 of this title, no change shall be made in the rates of pay, rules, or working conditions or established practices in effect prior to the time the dispute arose.

§ 156.

Carriers and representatives of the employees shall give at least thirty days' written notice of an intended change in agreements affecting rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, and the time and place for the beginning of conference between the representatives of the parties interested in such intended changes shall be agreed upon within ten days after the receipt of said notice and said time shall be within the thirty days provided in the notice. In every case where such notice of intended change has been given, or conferences are being held with reference thereto, or the services of the Mediation Board have been requested by either party, or said Board has proffered its serv-

ices, rates of pay, rules or working conditions shall not be altered by the carrier until the controversy has been finally acted upon, as required by section 155 of this title, by the Mediation Board, unless a period of ten days has elapsed after termination of conferences without request for or proffer of the services of the Mediation Board.

§ 160.

If a dispute between a carrier and its employees be not adjusted under the foregoing provisions of this chapter and should, in the judgment of the Mediation Board, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service, the Mediation Board shall notify the President, who may thereupon, in his discretion, create a board to investigate and report respecting such dispute. Such board shall be composed of such number of persons as to the President may seem desirable: *Provided, however,* That no member appointed shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or any carrier. The compensation of the members of any such board shall be fixed by the President. Such board shall be created separately in each instance and it shall investigate promptly the facts as to the dispute and make a report thereon to the President within thirty days from the date of its creation.

* * *

After the creation of such board and for thirty days after such board has made its report to the President, no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy in the conditions out of which the dispute arose.

Proof of Service.

I, JOSEPH P. ALLEN, counsel for the Respondents herein and a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, hereby certify that, on the 18th day of December 1959, I served copies of the foregoing Brief In Opposition to the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari on the Petitioners herein by mailing copies in duly addressed envelopes with first-class postage prepaid, to Petitioners' attorneys of record as follows: to George Halpern, 120 East 41st Street, New York, New York; Edith Lowenstein, 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York; and to Carl E. Newton, 2 Wall Street, New York, New York.

JOSEPH P. ALLEN,
Counsel for Respondents,
55 West 42nd Street,
New York 36, New York.